

# The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## Vester = Tvvs

A. E. Housman

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 3 / Issue 04 / October 1909, pp 244 - 248

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800018437, Published online: 11 February 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009838800018437](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800018437)

### How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1909). Vester = Tvvs. The Classical Quarterly, 3, pp 244-248 doi:10.1017/S0009838800018437

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## VESTER = TVVS.

Catull. 39 17-21.

nunc Celtiber es : Celtiberia in terra,  
quod quisque minxit, hoc sibi solet mane  
dentem atque russam defricare gingiuam ;  
ut, quo iste *uester* expolitor dens est, 20  
hoc te amplius bibisse praedicet loti.

Catull. 99 1-6.

surripui tibi, dum ludis, mellite Iuuenti,  
sauiolum dulci dulcius ambrosia.  
uerum id non impune tuli ; namque amplius horam  
suffixum in summa me memini esse cruce,  
dum tibi me purgo nec possum fletibus ullis  
tantillum *uestrae* demere saeuitiae. 6

'*uester*, de uno, per indignationem' (though I hardly see what indignation has to do with it) says Achilles Statius at the first of these two places, and again '*uester*, de uno' at the second. Muretus on the other hand explains '*uestrae saeuitiae*, ferocitatis illius, uobis omnibus, qui formosi estis, innatae.' Most commentators have taken part with Muretus, and deny that *uester* in these two passages means *tuus* ; nor is the usage recognised in the lexicons. But when it comes to explaining what, if not *tuus*, *uester* does mean, the interpreters are not agreed : they contradict one another, and they even contradict themselves.

Baehrens, like Muretus, takes *uestrae saeuitiae* as 'formosorum puerorum saeuitiae,' and Prof. Ellis also translates 'of you and others like you.' To establish this use of *uester* by examples is of course an easy matter. Muretus quotes Ouid. *her.* i 75 sq. 'quae *uestra* (= uirorum) libido est, | esse peregrino captus amore potes' ; Ellis and Baehrens add Prop. ii 29 32 'me similem *uestris* moribus esse putas,' iii 15 43 sq. 'at tu non meritam parcas uexare Lycinnam : | nescit *uestra* (feminarum) ruens ira referre pedem,' Ter. *ad.* 165 'noui ego *uostre* (adulescentium) haec, "nollem factum ; dabitur ius iurandum, indignum | te esse iniuria hac"' ; and others yet might be added, as Ouid. *her.* xvii 39 sq. 'credulitas damno solet esse puellis, | uerbaque dicuntur *uestra* carere fide.' Thus interpreted, *uestrae saeuitiae* has the advantage of being Latin, but it has the

disadvantage of making nonsense. 'Weep as I might, I could not lessen by a jot the rage of you and others like you.' What others? No other boy flew into a rage because Iuuentius was kissed, and Catullus' apologies were intended for no other boy. He would indeed have been a Simple Simon if he had expected, by sobbing over an individual, to diminish the generic ferocity of a type. The only 'saeuitia' which his 'fletus' could conceivably appease was the 'saeuitia' of a single boy on a single occasion.

Baehrens, but not Mr Ellis, understands *uester dens* in the same way, 'uestrum Hiberorum dens': again Latin and again nonsense. It is impossible that the details of a man's personal toilet should affect the colour of his countrymen's teeth. The teeth whose whiteness proved Egnatius 'bibisse lotium' were the private property of Egnatius, and no more belonged to any other Celtiberian than they belonged to the king of the Parthians. I never heard but of three persons to any one of whom the words *uester dens* could be addressed in any other sense than *tuus dens*: their names were Enyo, Pephredo, and Dino; ἦσαν δὲ αὐταὶ Κητοῦς τε καὶ Φόρκου, Γοργόνων ἀδελφαί, γραῖαι ἐκ γενετῆς. ἓνα δὲ ὀφθαλμὸν αἱ τρεῖς καὶ ἓνα ὀδόντα εἶχον, καὶ ταῦτα παρὰ μέρος ἤμειβον ἀλλήλαις.

Mr Ellis on the other hand at 39 20 renders *uester dens* by 'that Celtiberian tooth of yours,' i.e. of *thine*; and at 99 6 he gives as a second translation, without observing that it conflicts with his first, the English 'your (i.e. *thy*) boyish cruelty.' That makes excellent sense; but where else in Latin does this use of *uester* occur? Not in any passage cited by Mr Ellis. Take the first, Prop. iii 15 44 'nescit *uestra* ruens ira referre pedem': does *uestra ira* mean Cynthia's feminine anger against Lycinna? No; it means, as Mr Ellis himself translates, 'the anger of you women': the judgment 'nescit ruens referre pedem' is pronounced upon the whole sex. How then is *uestra ira* parallel to *uestra saeuitiae*, which does and must mean Iuuentius' rage at Catullus' conduct, or to *uester dens*, which does and must mean the tooth Egnatius polished every morning? Again, in Prop. ii 29 32 'me similem *uestris* moribus esse putas,' *uestris*, as Passerat says, is 'uironum': nobody thinks it necessary to invent the meaning 'tuus uiri moribus.' And again, at Mart. vi 43 6 'hoc mihi sunt *uestra*, Castrice, diuitiae,' Mr Ellis's own translation is 'of you millionaires,' not 'of thee, who art a millionaire.'

But those who interpret *uester* simply as *tuus* in these two poems of Catullus have no better success when they try to adduce parallels. Munro in *crit. and eluc.* p. 216 does not try; but Mr G. Friedrich at 39 20 and Mr A. Gudeman at Tac. *dial.* 10 try and fail. Mr Friedrich seeks his parallels in Catullus himself, and believes that he has found three. In 71 3 sq., 'aemulus iste tuus, qui *uestrum* exercet amorem, | mirifice est a te nactus utrumque malum,' it is quite true that *tuum* would make sense, so far as one can talk of sense in a corrupt epigram which has never yet been satisfactorily explained. But *uestrum* with its usual force will make sense equally, 'amorem qui tibi cum

eo communis est.' In 68 149-52 'hoc tibi, quod potui, confectum carmine munus | pro multis, Alli, redditur officiis,—ne *uestrum* scabra tangat rubigine nomen | haec atque illa dies atque alia atque alia' the use of *uestrum* is quite normal, and *uestrum nomen* is the same as 49 sq. 'nec . . . aranea . . . in deserto *Alli nomine* opus faciat.' The name *Allius* was no private possession of the *Allius* to whom Catullus addressed this poem: he shared it with the whole gens *Allia*, and it was impossible to immortalise the name of one *Allius* without immortalising the name of all. The editors have duly cited the parallels Cic. *pro Scaur.* 30 'si te (Triari) omen *nominis uestri* forte duxit' and Ouid. *trist.* ii 65, where Ovid, speaking of his *metamorphoses*, says to Augustus 'inuenies *uestri* praeconia *nominis* illic,' i.e. *Caesarei nominis*, although the 'praeconia' are in fact bestowed almost exclusively upon Augustus himself. As for Mr Friedrich's third example, Catull. 55 21 sq. 'uel, si uis, licet obseres palatum, | dum *uestri* sis particeps amoris,' neither *uestri* nor *tui* is admitted by the sense, which requires *nostri*, the uar. lect. of the cod. Sang.; and when Mr Friedrich translates 'aber meinetwegen behalte dein Geheimnis für dich, wenn du nur in deiner Liebe glücklich bist' his adversaries are likely to reply that a scholar who supposes *particeps amoris* to mean 'glücklich in Liebe' may well suppose *uester* to mean *tuus* or *suus* or *meus* or anything else. This is the last of Mr Friedrich's Catullian instances: outside Catullus he descends at once to Dracontius and the French *votre*.

Mr Gudeman begins by saying 'Scholars obstinately refuse to recognise the use of *uester* = *tuus*, although Munro, *Elucidat. to Catullus* p. 216, has adduced several indisputable instances, e.g. Cat. 39 20, 99 6.' Human nature being what it is, some scholars may perhaps be confirmed in their obstinacy when they find that this statement is not true: Munro adduced these two instances and no others. Mr Gudeman then, like Achilles Statius before him, quotes Verg. *Aen.* x 187 sq. 'cuius olorinae surgunt de uertice pinnae, | crimen, Amor, *uestrum* formaeque insigne paternae.' This is another of those places where *tuum* would satisfy all the requirements of the sense, but where *uestrum* in its ordinary meaning is none the less appropriate. The ἔρωτικὴ μανία, says Plato, is Ἀφροδίτης καὶ Ἐρωτος ἐπίπνοια, and Horace depicts this pair as inseparable, 'Veneremque et illi | semper haerentem puerum': *uestrum* therefore can be said for 'tuum et matris tuae' no less properly than *Aen.* ix 525 'uos, o Calliope, precor, adspirare canenti' for 'tuque tuaeque sorores,' or i 140 '*uestras*, Eure, domos' for 'tuas fraternasque,' or Sen. *Tro.* 532 sq. 'dum Phrygibus animos natus euersis dabit, | Andromacha, *uester*' for 'tuus et Hectoris.' The other passage cited by Estaço, Ouid. *fast.* i 285 sq. 'pax erat, et *uestri*, Germanice, causa triumphī | tradiderat famulas iam tibi Rhenus aquas,' is also irrelevant: '*uester* dicitur quippe res ductu Germanici auspiciis Tiberii gestae perscribebantur in arcu propter aedem Saturni' says Merkel. As for Mr Gudeman's two remaining instances, Tac. *dial.* 10 'nec solum cithurnum *uestrum* aut heroici carminis sonum, sed lyricorum quoque iucun-

ditatem . . . anteponendam ceteris aliarum artium studiis credo' and Cic. *de or.* iii 182 'trochaeum frequentem segregat ab oratore Aristoteles, Catule, *uester*,' anyone who insists that this *uestrum* and this *uester* mean respectively *tuum* and *tuus* must be prepared to show that Maternus was the only tragic poet in the world and that Aristotle had no adherent but Catulus. The use is the same as in Prop. ii 34 30 'nil iuuat in magno *uester* amore senex': the old poet, whoever he may have been, was studied not by Lynceus only but by those who shared his tastes.

For my own part I agree with Estaço and Munro that in Catull. 39 20 and 99 6 *uester* necessarily means *tuus*; so necessarily, that these two verses alone are enough to establish the usage. I think also that from the Latin of classical times I can produce two parallels, not more than two, which are certain. First however I will take two other passages, where this use of the word, though possible, is not indisputable.

I pass by Verg. *Aen.* xi 686-8 'siluis te, Tyrrhene, feras agitare putasti? | aduenit qui *uestra* dies muliebribus armis | uerba redarguerit' where the commentators, doubtless rightly, explain *uestra* as 'Tyrrhenorum.' But on Martial and on Ovid's *amores* we have no proper commentary, and the following instances require discussion. Mart. xii 98 1-6 'Baetis oliuifera crinem redimite corona, | aurea qui nitidis uellera tinguis aquis, | quem Bromius, quem Pallas amat, cui rector aquarum | Albula nauigerum per freta pandit iter, | omnibus laetis *uestras* Instantius oras | intret, et hic populis ut prior annus eat.' Here is the plural *uestras* referring to the singular *Baetis*; for it would be frivolous to pretend that the 'orae' are those of Baetis and Bromius and Pallas. But this is only an example of that confusion or identification of a town or country with its inhabitants on which I shall have more to say if I ever write a note on Prop. iv 3 10 or Manil. iv 602: it is exactly matched by Sil. iii 287 sq. '*uos* quoque desertis in castra mapalibus itis, | misceri gregibus *Gaetulia* sueta ferarum,' and as *Gaetulia* means *Gaetuli* so *Baetis* means *Baetici*. The next case is more obscure. In Ouid. *amor.* iii 1 35-40 Elegy addresses Tragedy as follows: 'quid grauibz uerbis, animosa Tragoedia,' dixit | 'me premis? an numquam non grauis esse potes? | inparibus tamen es numeris dignata moueri: | in me pugnasti uersibus usa meis. | non ego contulerim sublimia carmina nostris: | obruit exiguas regia *uestra* fores.' Here *uestra* looks as if it meant *tua*; for to whom but its queen does the palace of Tragedy belong? Well, perhaps to Atreus and Oedipus and the other princes whose crimes and misfortunes are her chief concern: 'regum facta' is Horace's name for the themes of tragedy in *serm.* i 10 42.

But the two examples which seem certain are the following.

Ouid. *amor.* ii 16 23 sq.

non, quae uirgineo portenta sub inguine latrant,  
nec timeam *uestros*, curua Malea, sinus.

A headland is not, like a realm or a city, conceived as the abode of man, that its name should summon up the notion of inhabitants; and the 'sinus' formed by the curve of Malea are her own, not held in partnership with any other cape on the coast.

Sen. *Herc. Oet.* 1512-4

perage nunc, Titan, uices  
solus relictus: ille qui *uester* comes  
ubique fueram, Tartara et manes peto.

No one except Titan, not Phoebe for instance, is here signified as the fellow-traveller of Hercules; for if that were so the removal of Hercules would not cause Titan to be 'solus relictus.' Bothe observed this and wished to alter the text; but this is now the fourth example we have found of *uester* = *tuus*.

If therefore anyone now chooses to give *uester* this meaning also in Catull. 71 3 and Ouid, *amor.* iii 1 40, although there is nothing in those two places which demands it, the practice of Catullus and Ovid does not forbid him. Nor does Ovid's practice forbid two conjectural emendations which had the countenance of Heinsius. Deianira begins her letter to Hercules with the verse (*her.* ix 1) 'gratulor Oechaliam titulis accedere *nostris*': 'nimis inuidiose profecto' says Heinsius 'mariti titulos inuadit et sibi uindicat, quod Hypsipyle Medae supra (vi 99 sq.) obiiciebat, "adde quod adscribi factis procerumque tuisque | se facit, et titulo coniugis uxor obest." recte igitur codices nonnulli "titulis . . . *uestris*." sic infra . . . Ariadne (x 130) "non ego sum titulis surripienda tuis." On the other hand it is to be observed that the three words 'titulis accedere nostris' recur in Luc. iii 555. In *her.* xix 59-62 Hero writes 'nam modo te uideor prope iam spectare natantem, | braccia nunc umeris umida ferre meis, | nunc dare, quae soleo, madidis uelamina membris, | pectora nunc iuncto *nostra* fouere sinu' where the sense would require *tua*, and Heinsius prefers the *uestra* of one or two MSS. Here however there is much to be said for the conjecture of Merkel, 'pectora nunc *nostro iuncta* fouere sinu': the error is of a common type enough: xviii 142 *nomine crimen, crimine nomen, met.* viii 762 *cortice sanguis, sanguine cortex*, xiii 494 *tuum mea, meum tua, trist.* iv 1 105 *tempora carmen, carmina tempus, fast.* iii 307 *pugnando . . . temptant, temptando . . . pugnant*.

A. E. HOUSMAN.